REMARKS

In the subject Office Action, the examiner noted that Applicants' Paper No. 3 was not fully responsive to the Office Action of September 9, 2004, rejecting Claims 1-2 under 35 USC 102(b). Applicants believe that this amendment is fully responsive to the September 9, 2004 Office Action, and therefore request reconsideration of their application in view of this amendment.

Applicants affirm the telephonic election by Delphi attorney Chmielewski to prosecute the invention of Species I, Claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, Claims 3-7 are designated herein as withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended herein to clearly distinguish over Mead '849 and Stojanovski '977. Amended Claim 1 recites first and second child seat anchor brackets oppositely disposed about a child seat, an anchor frame extending across a width dimension of the vehicle seat and secured to a frame of the vehicle seat; and first and second tension sensors securing the first and second child seat anchor brackets to first and second ends of the anchor frame. Applicants respectfully submit that no such arrangement is disclosed or suggested in Mead '849 or Stojanovski '977, and therefore request that the rejections under 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, and is patentable at least by virtue of such dependency.

Applicants believe that Claims 1 and 2 are patentable over the prior art of record, and respectfully request that such claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Navarre, Attorney Registration No. 29572

Telephone: (937) 653-3501